

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: May 26, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson
Joseph Coath, Vice-Chair
Stephen Peterson, Commissioner
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members:

Call to Order

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Stephen Peterson, present; Karen Plummer, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Old Business

ARC 05-08: Carter Financial Services, 222 South Cook Street (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)
Petitioner: Kevin Carter, owner

The petitioner is requesting approval of the installation of a new awning. The awning will be located over the north entrance to the building and will be maroon in color. The business name and the building number will be located on either side of the awning and per staff's recommendations; the awning will be made of either cloth or canvass.

Mr. Julian asked for verification of the color of the awning.

Mr. Carter replied the color will be burgundy.

Mr. Julian asked staff if company identification is allowed on both sides of the awning.

Mr. O'Brien responded the business name can only be on one side of the awning.

Mr. Julian asked which side the petitioner wanted the business name located.

Mr. Carter thought he was allowed to place the identification on more than one side, and if he had to choose, he will place the identification on the east side.

Mr. Julian asked if staff had any comments.

Mr. O'Brien responded no.

Ms. Troy asked if there were any other awnings on the building and if so, what color are they.

Mr. Carter replied there is one and the color is black and white.

Mr. Julian asked staff to read the conditions.

Mr. O'Brien stated the following:

1. The material of the awning shall be cloth or canvass.
2. The color should be burgundy.
3. Business identification shall be on one side of the awning only.

Mr. Julian asked the board if they were ready to consider a motion.

Motion:

Motion by Ms. Plummer to recommend approval of ARC 05-08. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Peterson –yes

Plummer –yes

Coath –yes

Julian - yes

Troy –yes

Motion carried.

ARC 05-05: Shops at Flint Creek, 500 North Hough Street (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)
Petitioner: HW Barrington Partners, LLC

Mr. Berlinghof, owner, noted the following revisions to the petition per the Architectural Review Commission's request.

1. The brick size has been changed.
2. The location of the bank has been changed.

Dave Duffy, Architect, The Jenkins Group

Mr. Duffy provided information on the revisions to the building based on the ARC's previous comments.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. Duffy how long the project been in the works.

Mr. Duffy responded a very long time.

Mr. Berlinghof informed the board that last June, the developer met with a number of architects to discuss different options. The displayed product allows for the maximum efficiency for the amount of space allowed.

Mr. Julian asked the petitioner asked if it was ever discussed to break up the buildings.

Mr. Berlinghof replied yes, but breaking up the building would be more expensive and less efficient.

Mr. Duffy commented that the breaking up the building would allow for less visibility of the stores.

Mr. Julian replied the proposal does not provide for great visibility.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that the location does not provide for great visibility, but this proposal is the best that can be provided.

Mr. Julian stated that he does appreciate the time and effort into the project, however, he has heard concerns from citizens and other commissions about this project and how it relates to the village. He would like to see more imagination put into this project.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that he does appreciate Mr. Julian's comments; however he does not believe that the commission understands the time and energy spent into making this project. Mr. Berlinghof stated that

there is nothing plain about this project and it would not be cost-efficient to build what the commission desires.

Mr. Coath asked the petitioner why they believe the visibility of the business is so important.

Ms. Plummer commented that she believes the exposure of the building is important.

Mr. Coath noted that he has received comments from residents concerning the streetscape of the project.

Ms. Plummer commented that due to the strangeness of the size of the lot and the location of the lot, she believes there is nothing more the developer could do.

Mr. Coath noted that the bank is the only building which is participating in the streetscape. He understands the developer's goal is to make this marketable; however he noted that the village is unique in that it can sometimes defy the marketing norms.

Ms. Troy commented that she liked the water fall. She was not sure if she liked the visibility of the creek and wondered why buildings were not located in front of the creek near the water fall. Ms. Troy asked if a traffic light will be installed at the entrance

Mr. Berlinghof they did look at placing a building in front of the creek, but decided against it. Regarding the traffic light, there is not one proposed at the site, however, there may be traffic enforcement at the site during peak hours.

Ms. Troy asked how many access points are proposed.

Mr. O'Brien stated there is only one access point and noted that the Illinois Department of Transportation would have great concerns if the site had more than one access point.

Ms. Troy asked for the height of the Staples roofline.

Mr. Peterson replied approximately thirty-five feet.

Ms. Troy asked for the footprint of the Staples building

Mr. Berlinghof replied the Staples building is approximately 20,000 feet, the entire retail building is approximately 38,000 square feet.

Mr. Coath remarked that he is concerned that the individual storefronts will not break up the mass.

Ms. Plummer noted that using individual storefronts can cause problems when an existing tenant moves out and another tenant moves in.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that their goal was to make something marketable as well as architecturally pleasing.

Mr. Duffy noted that the sign ordinance restricts the amount of signage and/or ornamentation allowed.

Mr. O'Brien clarified the purpose of the sign ordinance which is to restrict gaudy signs from being installed.

Mr. Julian asked if a second-story building was considered which would allow for more ornamentation.

Mr. Berlinghof replied that second story was primarily used for storage.

Mr. Coath asked if any of the Commissioners are concerned with the lack of depth to the store front.

Mr. Peterson commented that is more concerned with the lack of alternate height.

Ms. Troy asked if the creek will be used as a focal point.

Mr. Berlinghof noted that a bridge will be installed to connect to the creek within the year.

Mr. Julian asked if any of the materials have changed.

Mr. Berlinghof replied no, except for using smaller brick in the front and utility brick in the back.

Mr. Julian asked if any wood would be used on the project.

Mr. Berlinghof replied no.

Mr. Julian asked the petitioner to bring in brick and roof shingle samples for review.

Ms. Troy asked why the tower was behind the bank building.

Mr. Berlinghof replied the tower will aid as a visual to attract customers.

Mr. Coath asked if the petitioner could bring in cornice samples.

Ms. Troy asked if any of the stores require identity sign.

Mr. Berlinghof replied no.

Mr. Julian asked if the board had any additional comments.

Mr. Julian asked staff to read the ARC's comments.

Mr. O'Brien read the following:

1. The mass at the south (rear) elevation of the Staples building should be broken up.
2. Larger offset should be used on the front elevation should be explored.
3. Vary roof heights.
4. Submit bricks and roof shingle samples.
5. Provide section drawings of all cornices before final approval.

The petitioner will be meeting with the Architectural Review Commission on June 23, 2005.

Mr. Julian announced a five-minute recess.

New Business

ARC 05-12: Weyrauch Residence, 539 South Cook Street (Public Hearing – Historic)

Petitioner: Michael and Sia Weyrauch, owners

Mr. Julian swore those in those who would be speaking.

Dave Heidtke, architect, described the request. The petitioners are seeking approval of an amendment to the approved Certificate of Appropriateness for an alteration to a property in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District to construct a two-story addition on the east (rear) side of the existing home which will include a master bedroom and bathroom. The petitioner is also planning to remove part of the front porch and the remaining porch will be converted to living space.

Mr. Julian asked if anyone from the public wished to speak.

Warren Hayes, 545 S. Cook Street

Mr. Hayes felt that if the petitioners removed some of the porch, the home would look uneven.

Mr. Julian asked for the staff report.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the petition substantially complies with the applicable standards listed in Section 9.8.G of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff believes that the modifications to the structure are appropriate and modest in nature and recommends approval of ARC 05-12 with the following conditions:

1. All new windows shall be all-wood windows with historically accurate dimensions and proportions.
2. The siding material shall be limited to cementitious stucco and shall not be constructed of Exterior Insulation Finish Systems (EIFS).

Mr. Julian asked the commission if they believed the house is a contributing structure. The commission determined that the building is contributing.

Ms. Plummer asked the architects on the commission whether they felt the partial removal of the porch would be appropriate.

Mr. Peterson suggested that the petitioner either open the entire porch or not remove it at all and he would like to see a window sample. Mr. Peterson also noted that the addition should be separated from the primary structure and that the petitioner should use a different material on the addition with the eave broken up. Mr. Peterson also asked the petitioner to investigate whether the stucco board on the house is the original material and if it is, it might be a good idea to match the addition materials to the stucco.

Mr. Coath commented that he is not favorable to the asymmetrical porch. He would like to see a more open porch. Mr. Coath agreed with Mr. Peterson that the addition should be different from the primary structure. Mr. Coath asked if there were structures in the porch.

Mr. Heidtke replied that he could not tell as the area is covered up with siding.

Ms. Troy concurred with Mr. Peterson regarding the porch and the proposed addition. If the porch were to be open, she suggested installing more detailed columns than proposed.

Mr. Heidtke stated that the dormer was purposely pulled out due to the roof lines. He did not want the roof line to pop out of the existing house. Mr. Heidtke was under the impression that the addition should blend with the primary structure and is more than willing to restore the stucco. Mr. Heidtke stated that there are homes with partial porches in Barrington and the proposed windows will be Marvin windows.

Mr. Weyrauch stated that there is a home on Barrington and Russell Road with a partial porch. If the petitioners had to choose between an open porch or a closed porch, they would prefer a closed porch which would allow them additional living space.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. Peterson his thoughts on modifying the addition.

Mr. Peterson stated that the petitioners could lower the plate height and raise the roof which would give the petitioner more square footage.

Mr. Julian explained the meeting process to the petitioner.

Mr. Heidtke asked the commission if they would like the materials to be modified for the addition.

Mr. Julian replied that the materials or the elevation should allow for a differentiation from the primary structure.

Ms. Troy recommended staggering the plane and advised against adding shingles above the trim board.

Mr. Peterson asked if the garage will be modified.

Mr. Weyrauch responded that the garage roof will change as well as the garage doors.

Mr. Peterson asked for a plan for the garage.

Mr. Weyrauch asked the commission what the petitioners should do if the original siding was clapboard.

Mr. Peterson commented that the original material might be in good condition and could be restored.

Mr. O'Brien suggested that the petitioner determine the original material for the next meeting and staff would also want to see the garage modification plans prior to the meeting.

Mr. Hayes asked if the existing tree will be removed as there are many birds and animals that use the tree.

Mr. Weyrauch replied that the tree will not be removed, however, it will need to be pruned and a branch will be removed.

Mr. Julian asked staff to read the Architectural Review Commission's comments.

Mr. O'Brien read the following comments:

1. The ARC commented that the front porch as proposed may have an unbalanced look. The commission noted that they may consider the proposed plans for the front porch provided there was a good precedent in the Village. The ARC noted that the porch may need to be completely re-opened or remain entirely enclosed.
2. The window in the stairway on the north elevation should not be modified.
3. The new addition should be distinguished from the original home by creating an offset. Typically, the ARC requires that the offset be at least one (1) foot on each side of the structure.
4. Explore the massing of the rear dormer. The ARC recommended centering the window or adding windows on the north elevation. Additionally, the ARC noted that adding windows on the first floor may help improve the addition's massing.
5. The horizontal "accent board" on the north and south elevations should be eliminated.
6. A window sample or series and model number (with dimensions) should be presented to the ARC. The ARC found the proposed all-wood Marvin window to be appropriate; however, the commissioners recommend using a simulated divided light window in lieu of an authentic divided light window.
7. The owner should investigate whether the existing stucco is original. The ARC stated that if there was original weatherboard siding under the existing stucco, the weatherboard siding may be restored. The petitioner should report their findings and proposed siding material (if different) to the ARC for approval.
8. The eave, soffit and bracket details should be presented to the ARC for approval.

Motion:

Motion by Mr. Peterson to continue ARC 05-12 until June 23, 2005. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Peterson –yes

Plummer – yes

Coath – yes

Julian - yes

Troy – yes

Motion carried

ARC 05-13: Bank of America, 500 North Hough Street (Public Hearing – Non-Historic)
Petitioner: Hamilton Partners, LLC, owners

Tony Turek from Jones Lang LaSalle & Ray Kennedy from Gensler Architects

The petitioner is proposing to build a 4,500 square foot one-story, brick full-service banking facility on the outlot parcel as a part of The Shops at Flint Creek Development. The location will provide twenty-three onsite parking spaces (21 regular and 2 handicapped), and 3 drive-thru lanes. Two lanes will be full-service lanes and one lane for ATM service. The landscaping and site lighting will be consistent with the overall development. The interior layout consists of 4-6 walkup tellers, four banking offices and two interior 24-hour ATMs. The north side will be designated for business meetings. The parapet wall will have alternate. A fixed metal canopy will be used for the entry way.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the proposal can be revised and will make any revisions based on the ARC's recommendations.

Mr. Julian asked for staff comment. Staff had none.

Mr. Julian stated his concerns with the design of the building and its relationship to the retail shops. Will the bank brick be similar to the proposed project.

Mr. Turek replied that the proposed brick will be similar to the retail buildings.

Mr. Coath suggested that the petitioner use a more decorative cornices and brick.

Mr. Peterson asked what type of material will be used on the cornice.

Mr. Kennedy replied the cornice will be metal.

Mr. Julian stated that he is against this petition as proposed and doesn't feel that this building gives a presence.

Mr. O'Brien noted that Architectural Review Commission will be looking for this building to relate to the retail buildings as this building will be a focal point for the project. The Village of Barrington normally requires a more traditional look.

Mr. Julian concurred with Mr. O'Brien and noted that this proposal is an opportunity for the bank to make a statement of commitment to the community.

Mr. Berlinghof asked if the ARC is looking for a more traditional proposal or a plan similar in design to the retail site.

Mr. Julian stated that, while the building's design is good, he doesn't feel it is appropriate for this village.

Ms. Plummer stated that companies who come move to this area design their buildings with a more traditional look and the building should look similar in design to the retail site.

Mr. Peterson commented that the bank building will be the defining feature of the development.

Mr. Turek commented that they are willing to make changes proposed by the Architectural Review Commission.

Mr. Coath stated that the commission is looking for a more traditional building.

Ms. Plummer noted that due to the location of the building the bank might need to have two front entrances.

Mr. Julian asked how loyal the bank is to the red/blue logo.

Mr. Turek replied that they might be able to replace the logo with an awning.

Mr. Julian asked if the logo design is allowed in a B-4 Zoning District.

Mr. O'Brien read the B-4 Zoning requirement.

Ms. Troy asked if it would be possible to rotate the glass elevation facing Hough Street to the south elevation and have the elevation facing Hough Street more traditional in design.

Mr. Kennedy asked if they will be receiving a letter from the commission with their recommendations.

Mr. O'Brien responded that they will be receiving a letter.

Planner's Report

Mr. O'Brien provided information on the future cases.

Adjournment

Ms. Plummer moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Paula Emerson
Recording Secretary

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission